



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,796	10/14/2003	Jonathan David Garman	AVC72	4233
7590	10/03/2005		EXAMINER	
Jonathan David Garman			HOWARD, ZACHARY C	
772 Lucerne Drive				
Sunnyvale, CA 94085			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1646	
			DATE MAILED: 10/03/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/684,796	GARMAN ET AL.
	Examiner Zachary C. Howard	Art Unit 1646

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 May 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) 1-12 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Application, Amendments and/or Claims

Claims 1-12 are pending.

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-4, drawn to a method of detecting PDZ polypeptide binding to an α adrenergic receptor, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- II. Claims 5 and 6, drawn to a method of determining whether a test compound is a modulator of binding between a PDZ polypeptide and a PL polypeptide, classified in class 435, subclass 7.1.
- III. Claims 7-11, drawn to a modulator of binding between a specific PDZ polypeptide and an α adrenergic receptor PL polypeptide, classification dependent on compound structure, for example classified in class 530, subclass 300 if the modulator is a protein of 3-100 amino acids.
- IV. Claim 12, drawn to a method of treating a disorder comprising administering a modulator of binding between a specific PDZ polypeptide and an α adrenergic receptor PL polypeptide, classification dependent on compound structure, for example classified in class 514, subclass 12 if the modulator is a protein of greater than 25 amino acids.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for Inventions that are directed to different methods, restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons: Inventions I, II, and IV are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention I requires search and consideration of a method of detecting whether or not a PDZ polypeptide and an α adrenergic receptor bind to each

other, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention II requires search and consideration of a method of screening for modulators of binding between a known specific binding pair consisting of a PDZ polypeptide and α adrenergic PL polypeptide, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Invention III requires search and consideration of treatment of disorders by administering a modulator of a specific binding pair of consisting of a PDZ polypeptide and α adrenergic PL polypeptide, which is not required by any of the other Inventions. Furthermore, the distinct steps and ingredients require separate and distinct searches.

Inventions I and III are unrelated to each other. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the modulators of a specific binding pair consisting of a PDZ polypeptide and α adrenergic PL polypeptide are not used in the method of Invention I, which is detecting binding between a PDZ polypeptide and α adrenergic PL polypeptide.

Inventions III and II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the modulators of Group III can also be used in a method of generating antibodies to the modulator, which is a materially different method.

The inventions of Groups I-IV have a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications and separate, non-coextensive search requirements. As such it would be burdensome to search the inventions of Groups I-IV together.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, separate search requirements and/or divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election of species in Group II, III or IV:

If Group II, III, or IV is elected, in addition to the above restriction requirement, a further election of species is required as follows:

Applicant must elect one of the following patentably distinct species of specific binding pairs of PDZ polypeptide and α adrenergic PL polypeptide: one specific binding pair selected from Table 8, comprising one PDZ polypeptide and one α adrenergic PL polypeptide.

Each binding pair is considered to constitute a patentably distinct species because each binding pair has separate structures, and requires separate searches. Search of more than a single species would constitute an undue burden on the Office.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C 121 to elect a single species of specific binding pair for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 5-8, 11 and 12 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. **As part of this election, Applicant is also required to identify the SEQ ID NOs (if any) corresponding to the PDZ polypeptide and/or the α adrenergic PL polypeptide of the binding pair.**

An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record

Art Unit: 1646

showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) of the other invention.

Second election of species in Group IV:

If Group IV is elected, in addition to the above restriction requirement and first election of species, a second election of species is required as follows:

Applicant must elect one of the following patentably distinct species of disorders: One of the twelve species of disorders listed in Table 9.

Each disorder is considered to constitute a patentably distinct species because they have different etiologies and treatments, and require separate non-coextensive searches. Search of more than a single species would constitute an undue burden on the Office.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C 121 to elect one single species of disorder for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 12 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the

case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) of the other invention.

Rejoinder under Ochiai/Brouwer

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is advised that for the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Zachary C. Howard whose telephone number is 571-272-2877. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Caputa can be reached on 571-272-0829. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

zch



BRIDGET BUNNER
PATENT EXAMINER